



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/588,959	08/10/2006	Satoshi Eguchi	1374.46346X00	4026

20457 7590 08/11/2009
ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-3873

EXAMINER

SLUTSKER, JULIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2891

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

08/11/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

dlee@antonelli.com
rrodriguez@antonelli.com
lthenor@antonelli.com

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/588,959	Applicant(s) EGUCHI ET AL.	
	Examiner JULIA SLUTSKER	Art Unit 2891	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Julia Slutsker (Examiner). (3) William Solomon (Applicant's Representative).

(2) Asok Sarkar (Primary Examiner). (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 04 August 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Sukegawa (US 2003/0162370); Takahashi (US 6, 306, 211).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The difference between prior art and applicant's invention was discussed. Applicant's representative pointed out new limitations in the amended claim 1 that could overcome the existing prior art rejection. Applicant's representative also indicated that the RCE was filed. A new office action will be mailed in due time.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Asok K. Sarkar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2891	August 4, 2009
---	----------------